

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILIN	G DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/084,602	02/26/2002		Frederick L. Jordan	ORYXE.013A	1630
26271	7590	05/19/2004	EXAMINER		INER
		RSKI, LLP	TOOMER, CEPHIA D		
1301 MCKIN SUITE 5100	INEY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
HOUSTON,	TX 77010-	3095	1714		

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

Received

Attorney

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

'						
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/084,602	JORDAN, FREDERICK L.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Cephia D. Toomer	1714				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply to 16 NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we railure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	86(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 February 2004</u> . 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 25-78 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 25-78 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the did drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/03.	Paper No(s)/Mail D	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/084,602 Page 2

Art Unit: 1714

DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to the amendment filed February 26, 2004 in which claims 1-24 were canceled and claims 25-78 were added. It should be noted that no Terminal Disclaimer has been filed in this application.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 2. Claims 25-78 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 44-97 of copending Application No. 10/084236.
- 3. Claims 25-78 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 37-90 of copending Application No. 10/084579.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/084,602

Art Unit: 1714

4. Claims 25-78 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 29-82 of copending Application No. 10/084601.

- 5. Claims 25-78 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 25-78 of copending Application No. 10/084833.
- 6. Claims 25-78 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 28-81 of copending Application No. 10/084237.
- 7. Claims 25-78 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 39-92 of copending Application No. 10/084831.
- 8. Although the conflicting claims of the present invention and those of the copending applications are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the recitation of a fossil fuel additive encompasses the resid, gasoline, 2-cycle, and diesel fuel additives of the copending applications.
- 9. These are <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejections because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

Art Unit: 1714

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

- 11. Claims 32, 38, 49, 55, 59, 66, 76 and their dependents are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The original filed specification and claims, claim 10 for instance, do not support benzene, o-xylene, m-xylene, p-xylene, cyclohexane, hexane, octanes, nonane, 2-cycle oil, gasoline and resid fuel as a diluent for the additive composition. The specification teaches that these compounds are used as solvents.
- 12. Claims 28, 45, 46, 51, 55, 56, 61, 62, 65, 70, 72, 73, 78 and their dependents are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 28, 45, 55 and 72 are rejected because it is not clear how the vegetable oil and nut oil thermal stabilizers differ from the plant oil extract derived from grain.

Vegetables and nuts are also grains.

Claims 46 and 51 are substantial duplicates.

In claims 52, 62 and 70, "addition" should read – additive --.

Claims 56 and 61 are substantial duplicates.

Claims 73 and 78 are substantial duplicates.

Art Unit: 1714

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 14. Claims 34, 37-40, 62 and 65-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jordan (US 5,826,369).

Jordan teaches a carbonaceous fuel composition comprising a fuel additive of beta-carotene (carotenoid), chlorophyll (hydrophobic plant extract), ethoxylated castor oil (thermal stabilizer) and cetane improvers (see abstract; col. 2, lines 11-22). The carbonaceous fuel includes gasoline, diesel fuel, heavy fuel oil (resid), etc. (see col. 2, lines 23-43). The fuel additive may be diluted with a solvent such as gasoline, toluene, diesel fuel and alcohols (see col. 2, line 60 through col. 3, lines 1-6). Jordan teaches that the ethoxylated castor oil provides enhanced combustion characteristics and reductions in pollutant emissions.

Accordingly, Jordan teaching all the limitations of the claims anticipates the claims

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1714

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cephia D. Toomer whose telephone number is 571-272-1126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cephia D. Toomer Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714

10084602\051504